6/2/71

Dear Manny,

I asked Jerry Policoff to raise the question of malice within the new libel interpretations because I am without doubt of malicious intent but am not qualified to have a legal opinion.

It is not quite as simple as this "review" in the Sunday Times, nor of the selection of the Wolff letter alone for publication, under a heading that ridicules because it is the title of the first book, the one in question.

In the past the Times has defamed me, that is, the Sunday Times, and refused to print a correction even when not disputing the inaccuracy of the irrelevancies. In fact, including me in that story in itself is irrelevant.

I still have one of the original carbons of my 8/28/66 letter to Wolff which, I think adequately answers the question of fact. He was my source on being ordered not to review WHITEWASH, and because I considered his telling me this a sign of decency, I disguised him in the footnote. He had read FRAME-UP without adverse comment on it or the footnote, and he had spoken to at least Harris Dienstfrey about this at Cutorbridge and Dienstfrey before Kaplan's review, if that is what it is, appeared. After it appeared he told Harris that it embarrassed him and he would not review the book. It was planned for Newsweek. I am under the impression that Harris told me before publication that he had spoken to Wolff, who confirmed what I said. Harris will likely chicken on this because he will have more books he will want reviewed.

If it is possible I will enclose a carbon of my letter to the Times on the Epstein article and their response. My wife fell and hurt her knee last night. She is and will for at least several days be confined to bed. Until today's reading of the X-rays by an expert, we will not know. Meanwhile, an assistant U.S. Attorney from Baltimore is due momentarily on the case I discussed with you when I was in New York. If he is delayed (last time he didn't even come!) I'll have time to include these. If not, I'll send them as soon as I can.

The enclosed copy of a letter is one I seem to have forgotten when I gave you cases of Bell saying my books were out of print.

My recollection of the Epstein thing is that ultimately the Times offered me a few words for comment on the assassination, not to relieve the damage done me by them and Epstein. This is meaningless. Among the damages accomplished and, I think, intended, is with respect to publishers, to tell them not to be interested in my work and that if they by any chance don't take the hint, this is what they can expect on its appearance.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg